



ABSTRACT

Refull milk pricing and other selected merchantising practices used by retail food istores to sell milk in 56 markets are malyyed. The stores sold with during 1969-71 at many prices-ranging from three prices in better sold with scatter results of the stores and the scattering the store of the store sold with State retail pricing regulation than in those without regulation. In regulated markets, with State retail pricing regulation than in those without regulation. In regulated markets, and which they reproduct on call milk was sold at modal (most comparison than in unregulated markets. Chain-owned supermarkets generally prices than in unregulated markets. Chain-owned supermarkets generally prices than the importance of retail the missesses in the marketing of milk as indicated by their use of store brands and backened integration by the stores into with

Keywords: Nilk, pricing, marketing, sales, chainstores.

PREFACE

This is a companion report to Agricultural Economic Bopout No. 207, Pricing Mills and Bodry Products-Principles, Practices, and Problems, by Aldon C. Banchester, published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in June 1971. For the present report, tables 3 and 7 to 16 of the enries rately have been resulting the property of the Pricing May 1971 for 17 additional markets in the Southeastern St. 2016 letter for the Continue, South Carolina, Googsia, Porton, and Tunesseen

The study focuses on the current situation in milk pricing and other merchandising practices of rotall foodstores. These practices influence consumer demand, marketing costs and efficiency, and returns to producers.

CONTENTS

	1.0
SUDDARY	. 1
INTRODUCTION	. :
SCOPE OF STUDY	. :
SOURCE OF NILK FOR MARKETS	. :
BRAND AND PACKAGING ARRANGEMENT	
Supermarkets Convenience Stores	. :
Dairy Stores Whole Milk Sales	
NILK PRICING STRUCTURE Variation in Sales From Modal Prices	. 12
Brand Pricing Milk Price Differentials Between Containers Milk Prices in Supermarkets and Other Foodstores	. 17
Price Differentials Between Whole and Lowfat Milks	21
COMPARISON OF CHAINSTORE PRICES WITH THOSE OF OTHER SUPERMARKETS	. 21
SALES BY TYPE OF CONTAINER	21
LOWFAT MILK SALES IN SOUTHEASTERN MARKETS	2.5
APPENDIX	28

STIMMARY

The number of retail prices for milk sold during 1969-71 in 55 Eastern markets ranged from three in Montgonery, lat, to 26 in Humington, N. Ye. The number of selling prices in the markets was influenced by: Whether States regulated retail prices; number of states and kinds of containers; number and kinds of brands of milk sold; differences in butterfar content; and the pricing policy of store.

The proportion of milk sold as modal (most common) prices was much higher in controlled markets-that is, markets where prices were regulated by the State. Over one-half of the milk in 52 percent of the controlled markets was sold as modal prices, whereas comply 21 percent of the uncontrolled markets had over 50 percent of sales at modal prices. In eight controlled markets in three Southeastern States, 80 percent of the milk was sold as modal prices, 19 market in four other Southeastern States, 30 percent of the milk was sold as the market in four other Southeastern States, 30 percent of the milk was sold as the milk was sold as the so

Modal selling prices for store and processor brands were generally the same in controlled markets. In uncontrolled markets, store-brand prices were 1 to 3 cents lower per half gallon then processor brands.

Generally, supermarkets priced milk somewhere between the prices charged in dairy stores and those in commentence stores. In markets with both dairy and convenience atores, milk prices in dairy atores were below supermarket prices in about three-fourths of the markets, and convenience store prices were higher than those is numermarket in about severe-tenths of the markets.

Store price differentials between whole and lowfar milks warted considershyl among the markets. Generally, whole milk was priced higher than lowfar milks; however, in some markets, whole milk was priced below lowfar. Whole milk was priced 0.01 cent to 10.0, cents per half gallow below 1-percent milk in part of the milk was priced below 2-percent milk in parcent of the markets, 0.05 cents below 4-percent milk in proceed of the markets; and 2.0 cents to 10.9 cents below whim milk in 6 procent of the markets;

chain supermarkets priced half gailons of milk below voluntary and coperative stores in 52 percent of the markets, at the same price in 12 percent, properative stores in 52 percent of the markets, at the same price in 12 percent, cooperative stores bent together the price of the same of the same half gailons were below those of independent stores in 60 percent of the markets, the same in 10 percent, and above in 30 percent. The difference in price was examily 1 to 2 cents, whether the chainstore price was above or below Store-brand milk accounted for 57 percent of all milk sold in the 56 markets, processor-brand milk for 37 percent, and store brands sold by processorounce stores for 6 percent. Slightly over one-helf of the store-brand milk was beried in plants comed by the stores.

Eighty-five percent of the milk sold in the markets was obtained from processors located outside the incorporaced boundaries of the cities. Sliphtly over true-thirds of this "outside" milk came from processors within 50 miles, 23 percent from processors located between 50 and 149 miles, and 95 percent from processors within 150 miles, 27 percent from processors within 150 miles, 27 percent from processors within 150 miles.

The volume of processor-brand milk moved into the surfacts was 5.7 percent greater than the volume of store-brand milk. Slightly over 90 percent of the processor-brand milk came from within tho sites, whereas only 79 percent of the store-brand milk came in within this distance. The remaining processor-brand milk came from distances between 100 to 199 miles and the accre-brand transported ower 100 miles was bottled in store-wound processing in limits.

MILK SALES IN FOODSTORES: PRICING AND OTHER

bν

W. Webster Jones Agricultural Economist

INTRODUCTION

The retail foodstore has become the most important customer of the milk distributor as well as the most important source of milk for most consumers. Merchandising practices used by retail foodstores to sell milk are, therefore, of significant interest to all segments of the dairy industry and to consumers.

In 1999, half of all fluid milk was sold through such retail outlets as supermarkets, convenience stores, dairy stores, other grocesy stores and delicetessens, and commisseries. Home delivery, the maintary of nilk distributors for many years, has almost disappeared in many cities. It now accounts for less then one-fourth of all nilk males. Institutional outlets, vending less than one-fourth of all nilk males. Institutional outlets, vending sales. 3/ all sales to consumers account for the remedizing sales. 3/

These changes in sales outless, along with such other changes as loss of space in dairy cases in stores, increased usage of store brands, integration into mill processing by retailars, and changes in milk procurement policies by stores, have considerably weekened the influence milk processors once exartised in sales of their product. Thus, processors have lost much of the close contact with consumers they once had.

Consumers in any given merket are not confronted with any one price for whole mills. The number may very from as few as three to more than 20. In a given store, the number of prices may range from three to six or more. Most individual store difference come from: Selling mills in more than now size and individual store of difference come from: Selling mills in more than now size and selling mills in the selling first content; and whether ratedly price are regulated.

Minimum prices to producers for milk in the areas included in this study are regulated either by State or Federal orders. Therefore, the basic raw milk costs in a given community are essentially the same and do not account

^{1/} Manchester, Alden C. Pricing Milk and Deiry Products--Principles, Practices, and Problems. U.S. Dept. Agr., Agr. Econ. Rpt. No. 207, p. 11. June 1971.

for the variations in retail prices within a market. The variation results from differences in marketing costs and charges, and in merchandising policies,

Consumers are affected by price differentials for fluid milk and adjust purchasing patterns accordingly. To the extent that such adjustments result in decreased fluid milk consumption, returns to producers are lowered. To the extent that purchases are miffered between retail sources, the shift brings about adjustments in the competitive structure. Price differences and merchandsing policies, therefore, are significant to producers, connumers, and

The increased use of store-brand milk has not only increased the proportion of milk sold under store labels but also has undoubtedly caused a decline in the average number of brands of milk sold per store. This is true sepecially for chainstores, many of which carry only their own brand or their own brand olus one processor brand.

This study examsines some of the more important merchandising practices used by retail foodstores to sell milk. The mean focus is on the pricing structure for milk and the kinds and relative importance of different brands of milk sell.

SCOPE OF STUDY

The analysis includes data for 436 stores in 56 markets-346 supermarkets, 49 convenience stores, and 41 dairy stores. Nost of these are representatives of chainstore divisions, so that a substantial portion of milk sales in the eastern United States is included.

Data for 39 markets were collected in 1969-70 by the Morthmask Regional Debry Narbeting Committee (URL+40); these markets are located in 16 Morth-ceaters, Middle Atlantic, and Morth Contral States, 27 Data for the other 17 markets, in wewn Southeastern States, were collected in May 1971 during the suthor's visits to the dairy departments of each store (see the appendix for listing of markets).

Twenty-chree markets were in States that regulated (controlled) both the farm and store prices of milk. All but one of these States also had trade practice regulations. The other 33 markets were in States which exactised no control over retail pricing of milk. One of themes States had the authority to fix rotail prices but was not using it, and two others had trade practice regulations.

The 436 stores surveyed represented 38.9 percent of all milk sold in the 56 markets. Stores in State-controlled markets accounted for 26.1 percent of total sailes, whereas stores in uncontrolled markets accounted for 45.7 percent.

^{2/} Includes District of Columbia. See footnote 1.

Supermarkets accounted for about 87 percent of the store sales of milk in the markets. The remaining 13 percent was about equally divided between convenience and dairy stores.

SOURCE OF MILK FOR MARKETS

Earlier in this contury, all milk sold in retail foodstores in most communities was produced Locally. However, in amory cities today, a large part of the milk sold in stores may come from farms or bottling plants located over 100 miles sway. Some of the occommic forces which brought should this change in small the grow in time, so supply areas have expended; (2) courts have struck down many of the local sanitary and other regulations which once restricted the flow of milk between markets; (3) technological improvements in transportation, refrigeration, pendeging, and highways have seased the flow of milk into marlects; (4) technological changes in milk processing have resulted in fever and larger plants with concurrent meed for larger supply and distribution areas; ward integration into processing and contralited procurement programs; and (6) consumer sales have shifted from home delivery to retail foodstores.

Only 15 percent of the milk sold in the stores surveyed came from processors located within the corporate limits of the cities in which the stores were located. The remaining milk came from processors located within a 250-mile radius. Two-thirds was obtained from processors within 50 miles, 23 percent from 50 to 249 miles, and 9.5 percent from 50 to 249 miles, and 9.5 percent from 50 to 249 miles (table 1).

The volume of processor-brand milk shipped into the markets surveyed was sightly higher than the volume of store-brand milk. However, store-brand milk tended to come from greater distances. Almost four-fifth of the processor-brand milk came from processing plants located within 50 miles, compared with only 37 percent of the store-brand milk. Ten percent of the store-brand milk moved into the markets from distances greater than 100 miles pearly 37 percent of this milk was built of a store-county from the control of the markets from distances greater than 100 miles meantly 37 percent of the milk was built of a store-county from the control of the milk was built of a store-county from the control of the milk was built of a store-county from the control of the milk was built of the store and was a store than 100 milks with the milk was stored to be stored to be stored to be stored to was a stored to be sto

BRAND AND PACKAGING ARRANGEMENT

Managers of rotail foodstores generally profer to handle popular brands of mik--that is, brands that will bring customers into their stores. Even more so, managers profer to sell store brands of milk because it helps to build consumer loyalty and sllows more control in procuring and promoting the sals of milk. 4/

^{3/} Conner, M. C., and McCullough, T. B. Cost Analysis of Distributing Milk in Outside Markets. Va. Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ. Res. Div. Bul. No. 68, p. 47. Dec. 1971.

^{4/} Fallert, Richard F. A Survey of Central Milk Programs in Midwestern Food Chains. U.S. Dept. Agr., Mktg. Res. Rpt. No. 944, p. 15. (No. Central Reg. Pub. No. 211.) Dec. 1971.

Table 1--Proportion of whole milk sold, by distance from processor to store, type of brand, and type of market, 56 markets, 1969-71

	Distance					:
Type of brand and market	49.9	99.9	149.9	150- 199.9	249.9	:Total
	:		Percent	of milk		
Processor brand:	:		AGA COME	OA MEAN		
Controlled markets	: 2.9	4.0	0.4			7.3
Uncontrolled markets	. 37.4	3.5	1.8	2.8		45.5
Subtotal	40.3	7.5	2.2	2.8		52.8
Store brand:						
Integrated;	;					
Controlled markets	: 6.0	2.3	0.2	. 9	0.4	9.8
Uncontrolled markets .	, 8.3	3.3	2.4	3.7	1.0	18.7
Subtotal	14.3	5.6	2.6	4.6	1.4	28.5
Custom packaged:						
Controlled markets	3.9	1.5	.1		~ ~	5.5
Uncontrolled markets .	8.8	3.2	.5	.7		13.2
Subtotal	. 12.7	4.7	.6	.7		18.7
Total store brand	27.0	10.3	3.2	5.3	1.4	47.2
Total	67.3	17.8	5.4	8.1	1.6	100.0

⁻⁻ means not applicable.

^{1/} Distance outside city limits.

The stores surveyed fall into four categories: (1) those saling store brands only; (2) those selling both store and processor brands; (2) those selling store brands only; and (4) those owned by processors selling store brands only. Those selling store brands only. Those selling store brands only represented 2.3 percent of all stores and store brands of the selling store brands only represented 2.3 percent of cotal sales. Slightly over three-fourths of the selling store brands of the selling store brands of the selling store sell

Supermarkets

Almost half of the 346 supermarkets surveyed solf both store and processor brands of silk. Silkstly over 65 percent of these stores carried one store brand, either integrated (packaged in a store-owned plant) or custom packaged, and one processor brand. Another 31.5 percent of the stores had one more processor brand. The other attree handled three to five processor brands in additionable to the store and the store and

Supermarkets solling only processor brands accounted for slightly over one-third of all supermarkets. The number of brands averaged 2.4 per store. Twenty-one percent sold only one brand, about 55 percent sold two to three brands, and the others sold four to six brands.

Slightly over 17 percent of the stores handled store brands only. Twothirds of these stores sold only one primary brand. About one-fourth also had one secondary brand.

Over 61 percent of all milk sold by supermarkets in the 55 markets was sold under store label. This was about equally divided between integrated store brand and custom-packaged store brand. The remaining milk was sold under a processor label.

The proportion of supermarkets with store-brand stilk in uncontrolled marlests was 25 percent higher than that for supermarkets in controlled markets, the property of the controlled supermarkets makinged all or part of their property. The property of the controlled supermarkets are supermarkets and supermarkets in the controlled supermarkets are supermarkets and supermarkets have greater secondic incentive to integrate backward into milk processing, whereas in uncontrolled sarkets, stores have greater freedom to promote

Convenience Stores

The 49 convenience stores surveyed were of two types: Those which sold processor brands only and processor-owned stores which sold store-brand milk.

14 marbara 1969-71 1/ Table 2--Percentage of whole milk sold, by type of store, type and size of market, brand, and packaging arrangement,

				Porce	Percent of milk and inc.	and dine				
	Brand and packaring		Suma	Gunavacathara						I
	arrangements	Sealle	narkets	2	ı	. 411	Commentance	Dader	411	
		Uncont.	: cont. 2/	: Dacont.	1	markets	stores	stores	stores	
					Percent 3/	37				
	Stores selling own brand only:					1				
	Primary brand	4.1	9.6	-	18.6	33.5	,	13.1	4 10	
	Secondary brand	3	٩	6.9		100	::		2.5	
	Prinaty brand 4/	9.9	3.6	1	19.3	7.4	;	11.8	2.0	
	Subtotal	16.1	11.8	58.0	34.9	32.7		0.90	21.0	
	Stores selling own and processor brand: Store brand:									
	Integrated:									
	Pefssary brand	10.2	4.6	2.0	1	5.1	;	6.4	8,4	
	Secondary brand	4.	7	:		7	;	;	۲.	
	Ouston packaged:									
	Primary brand	33.1	16.1	0.61	16.6	23.0	:	:	20.0	
	Secondary brand	9.7	:	;	:	5.	:	;	ń	
	Processor brand:									
	Processor supplying store brands:									
	Prinary brand	12.2	10.8	9.6	8.1	10.3	;	;	8,9	
6	Secondary brand	τ,	ξĺ	1	;	.,	;	;	25	
	Other processors									
	Primary brand 4/	10.4	5.4	4.		6.3		3.8	3.8	
	Subtotal	0.89	41.8	31.0	24.7	43.4		6.7	38.1	
	Stores selling processor brands only:									
	Carb brand (8)1	* *							4 0 2	
	Two brands	1 00	26.0	0	1	10		111	2.5	
	Three brends	2			2 0		2 =		4 1	
	Pour hyands								ì	
	Sine bronde	2				0 "		:		
		: :	1;	:	:	7	:	:	-:	
	secondary brand of	7.7	'n	1.4	:	10		:	۵0.	
	Subtotal	17.9	4.6.4	11.0	20.4	23.9	51.5	3.1	24.5	
-	Processor-owned store 4/	:	;			:	48.3	43.3	6.0	
	Grand total ; 100.0	100.0	0.001	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

ann our opposition.

I Then ancher are not a representative semple of the fatted States. They was located in Alabama, Connection; Balanter, District of Challesk Parties, consection; Balanter, District of Challesk Parties, consection; Balanter, District of Challesk Parties, consection; Balanter, District of Challeske, Parties and March States.

Townsteen, Veryale, and March States, Annual States, New Emphasis, Seath Carolina, States, Challeske, Cha

2. The advances that it could print control as a faithbur, properties, and a faithful and a f

	Purcent of stores		707	Percent of stores	stores				
Á.									
	7.7	8.9	17.2	3.1	9.0	6.3	;	53.7	10.8
		œ	;	:	;	e.	:	;	°.
2 " + 1 "	0	00	24.1	1.6	4.5	3.5	:	1	3.4
	1.7	1.6	;	4	47	6.	;	:	7
Custom-packaged (CP) brands only:		;	13.8	9.3	6.6	9.9	:	7.3	6.2
Subrocal 1/	ľ	12.1	55.2	14.5	8'61	17.27	:	1'19	21.3
Stores selling own and processor brands:									
Stores selling integrated brands:	1.5	4.4	3.4	10.9	6 6		:	2.4	0.0
	12.8	12.1	3.4	1,6	1.8	5.5	:	;	4.4
:		99	;	3.6	3.5	2.3	;	:	80
integr. + 1 sec. integr.	1.7	1.6	;	1.0	0	9	;	:	٠,٠
+	6.	60	;	;	:	ę	:	:	9
1 - 2 - 1 - 1	;	1	:	;	:	ņ		i	7
1 " " + 1 prim, proc, + 1 sec. proc	;	1	١	'n	4.	ņ	ţ	:	*
			0.01	10.6	16.0	0 11	;	9	11.3
1 prim, CP + 1 prim, processor 92.9	17.0	25	1		11.3	10	;	,	7.8
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	: :	: ;	1	5.7	2.0	00	;	:	5.5
: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	2.6	2.4	. ;	0.	*	1.4	:	;	1.7
			;	s.	4,	6.	1	;	P.
			;	1.0	6.	9.	:	;	'n
			;	s.	4,	r:	ì	;	2
			ı	v.	ď.	7	;	:	re i
arie, proc. + 1 sec. pro			;	9.7	1.4	o,	;		•
1 " + 1 wer CF + 3 ords, proc. + 1 sec. proc		10			:	-	1	1	1
Subtotal 1/	64.5	4	17.2	26.0	8	68.5		3	7.
		27.3	0.0	2,3	7.2	7.2	55.1	4.5	12.2
	-	10.5	10.3	6.2	8.9	8.1	8.2	2.4	3.6
		16.9	1	8.3	7.2	10.7	4:1	;	9.0
:	7.3	7.2	1	1.5	4.1	9.5	;	;	64
:	1.7	1.6	;	1.5	4	1.4	ı	;	3
	1		10.3	1.0	7.7	4.1	2.0	:	-
	;		ı	1.0	0.	9	;	:	?;
. 1+				0	7	-	1		
Subtotal 1/	6 44.4	9	27.6	25	23.2	ţ	Š		
Proceeder-pared - 1 printer 2/		1	,		1		970	26.8	0
Total 1/	0.001 0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100	0.001	0.001

Table 4--Number of brands of whole milk per store, by type of store, type and size of market, and kind of bra

The of control and control a						Date with size	or marner, a	of kind of b		16-69-11
Fig. 20 Control Cont	Type of store, kind and size of market, and	Ш	brands only	plos spus	Store at	with different	psckaging a	rangements:	- 1	
Comparison Com	brand sold	Integrated			Integrater	1. Custon-packs	J 4	Processor . brands culy		
### 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 1	Supermirkers				.4	denber of brand	.91			
1	Lorge markets:									
######################################	Prinary		;	1.0	:		:			
The state of the s	Secondary	i				5.0	5.0	5.0	:	1.7
The continue of the continue	Small markets:					:	:	:	:	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Primary		;	1.3	0					
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Secondary	7	:	2	17	7	NO -	2.7	;	2.6
### 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	Derivorania Derivorania						7.		:	۳.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Secondary		:	1.2	2,8	2,7	2.3	0		
######################################		4	:	~	7	7.	7	: :		2.5
1	Large markets.									7.
### 15 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Primare		:							
whether the control of the control o	Secondary		7.0	0.7	5.7	2.0	2.2	1.4	;	
### 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	Scall narkets:			ţ	;	ı	;	4	;	2
### 15 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Primary	171	1.0	0.						1
1	Secondary	4		:	6.7	N N	2.7	2.4	:	2.4
10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Total uncontrolled .			:	,	7.	7	.2	;	7
######################################	Primary	1.0	1.0	1.0	5.6	0 0		:		
1	Secondary	10	:	6.			7.7	7.7	:	2.2
1	All supermirkats:			:		,	7.	Di.	1	7
	Primary	1.1	1,0	1.3	2.6	,				
1	Secondary	*	;			;	7.7	5.5	1	2.3
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Subcocal	1.5	1.0	1.3	2.7	8.6	- 00	-		
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Primaria							:		2.4
10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	Secondary	0.4	1.0	1.0	1	:	1	1.2	0	,
1	Sehrorel	1		7	:	;	;			71.7
	Dairy stores;	0.7	1.0	4.4	1			1.4	1.0	-
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	~	1.0	0.		0					:
1.1 1.0 1.0 2.6 2.7 2.7 2.1 1.0 1.0 1.1 1.0 1.1 1.0 1.1 1.0 1.1 1.1	All stores:				0.7	2.0	2.0	1.5	1.0	1.1
1.3 1.0 1.2 2.7, 2.0 2.8 2.2 1.0	i,	1.1	1.0	1.0	2.6	2 6		,		
1.0 1.2 2.7, 2.8 2.8 2.2	Total			-3	7.	7	-	7.7	0.1	2.7
		57	1.0	7.7	2.7.	2.8	2.8	2.3	1.0	- 6
	means not applicable.									i

Generally, both types of stores carried only one brand of milk. A few of the stores selling only processor brands carried two or three brands; also, a few of the processor-owned stores had a secondary brand (table 3).

Dairy Stores

Almost 27 percent of the dairy stores were owned by milk processors; however, about 56 percent were owned by other organizations which had their own milk processing plants. The other stores were not directly associated with plants through ownership.

Almost 88 percent of the dairy stores (including those processor owned) sold only store-brand milk. Both processor and store brands were handled by allgbily over 7 percent, and processor brands only by the remeining 5 percent. Most dairy stores sold only one brand of milk, sithough a few stores had two or three brands (table 3).

Whole Milk Sales

Sales by supermarkets accounted for 86.9 percent of all whole milk sold by the stores surveyed. Convenience and dairy stores shared about equally the remaining 13.1 percent.

Store brands accounted for the largest where of milk swies in the 56 markean. For all stores, atore brands represented 5.6 percent of sales; processor brands, 37.2 percent; and store brands sold in attrees omned by processors, 6.0 percent (toble 2). Stightly ower one-bid between the store-brand salk was processed in store-owned plants. These plants were almost all owned by regional and national claimators organizations.

Store-brand milk was much more important to chainsterse than to other types of supermetrics. It accounted for 614 percent of the sales of chainsterses 33.8 percent of the sales of voluntary and cooperative stores 5/; and 8.3 percent of the sales of independent stores. Chainsterse accounted for large types of the sales of independent stores. Chainsterse accounted for integrated store brands; and 22.0 percent of all successpacinged sales (table

The independent and voluntary or cooperative stores sold mostly processor brands of still. These brands represented 89.2 percent of the sales by independents and 66.7 percent of the sales by voluntary or cooperative stores. A few of the voluntary or cooperative stores arrayed and integrated atore brands of silk; however, this accounted for only 6.4 percent of salk sold by these stores (table 5) percent of salk sold by these stores (table 5).

^{5/} Voluntary stores are banded together by a wholesaler who sacks them out; cooperatives band together to organize a wholesaler to serve them.

Stand and Dackaging		Chainstores		Inc	Independent		Voluntary	Voluntary and cooperative	tva	
- 1	Controlled	Controlled - Uncontrolled markets - markets		Controlled . Total . merbets	Controlled 'Uncontrolled markets - markets	fotal	Controlled	Stores Controlled 'Uncontrolled markets markets	: e	: Total
Stores selling only				-1	Percent					
Integrated		20.2	24.4	1	1	1	4.0	,	4.0	24.8
Subtotal	9.8	23.0	31.6							2.2
Stores selling own and processor brand: Own brand;									ŧ	7
Integrated Guston-packaged	6.5	7.4	20.2	::	15	15	44	12	1.2	4.00
Custom-packaged Other processor	8.5	~ 0	9.9	: ;	77	A	r,	1.1	1.2	7.8
Subtotal	9.6	29.0	38.6		-	-		3.6	. 0.4	7
Stores selling only - Processor brands: One brand	2	2.2	10.1	1	ņ	*	71	*		-
Three "	9.0		00 4	Į,	97.	2:	ď	,	7	6.1
	4	. 2	; •	7)2	٦,	>í°	2.7	;	5.7	6.5
Secondary brands	ıª	; [«]	; "	i	1	,	i Fil	: :	i i i	?⊃
Subtotal	Č.	8.5	21.7		7	,	57.2	ŀ	9:0	25.3
Grand total	31.4	60.5	91.9	.2	2	-	1.1	. 4	į	

MILK PRICING STRUCTURE

Among markets, the number of prices in stores ranged from 26 in Nuntington, N. Va., to three in Montgomery, Ala. The difference between these two markets was due largely to the presence or lack of price competition. Betti milk prices were regulated by the State in Montgomer or lack of price competition. Betti milk prices were regulated by the State in Montgomer or lack of prices to money the state of the money of the state of the money that the state of the money of the state of the money that the state of the money of the state of

Supermarkets, especially chainstores, in any given market may have various milk pricing policies. Some examples are (1) streamled pricing, and (3) individual store pricing. In arounder pricing, the price of milk in each store in the market is the same. Store managers, some pricing, the market store in the market is the same. Store managers, some pricing, the market is divided into zones with variation in milk prices between pricing, the market is divided into zones with variation in milk prices between prices to ment competition.

Table 6--Distribution of markets with specified numbers of prices for whole milk, by type of market, 56 markets, 1969-71

Number of prices :	Controlled	: Uncontrolled
	markets	. marketa
	Mar.	mber
	1 100	HOEL.
	±	
	3	
		2
	6	1
	3	2
	4	2
	2	Š
	ī	2
************************************	-	:
***************************************		1
	1	3
***************************************	1	3
		2
	1	2
***************************************		3
		í

************		1
		<u> </u>
		1
Total		
Total	23	33

⁻⁻ means not applicable.

^{6/} Federal Trade Commission. Reconomic Report on Pood Chain Selling Practices in the District of Columbia and San Francisco, July 1969.

Variation in Sales From Model Prices

The proportion of milk sold at each marker's model (most common) price was much higher in controlled markers where store prices were recombanded by State authortizes (table 7). In eight controlled markets in Alabama, South Carolina, and Virginia, Solo, percent of the suft was sold at model prices, 19.5 percent above, and only 0.7 percent below. In contrast, in nine Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, and Tennessee uncontrolled markets, 33.8 percent of all milk was sold at model prices, 45.2 percent was sold above, and 21.0 percent was sold below. In 26 of the 32 northold markets awarened, milk sold at model with the sold and the sold at model and the sold are the sold at the sold and the sold and the sold are the sold at the

In only 12 of the 23 controlled markets was any milk sold below model prices. In 10 of the 12 markets, the amount of milk sold at prices below the mode ranged from 0.1 to 14.9 percent of total sales. In 11 of the 12 markets, prices ranged from 0.1 cent to 1.9 cents below model prices (table 8).

More milk was sold below modal prices in uncontrolled markets than was sold at or above that level. In onely five uncontrolled markets was no milk sold at lower prices. However, in five other markets, 60,0 to 74,9 percent of at milk was sold below modal prices. Note milk sold at 0.1 to 17,9 cents per at milk was sold below modal prices. Note milk sold at 0.1 to 17,0 cents per mode of the control of the contr

Some milk was sold above modal prices in all controlled markets. In 10 of the controlled markets over 50 percent of all milk was sold above modal prices and in no market did sales at these prices account for less than 5 percent of the milk sold. In this range, milk was sold in more narkets a rytices ranging from 2.2 to 5.9 cents above modal prices than at any other price. In 14 confirmal controlled the milk of the prices in the confirmal confirmal controlled the prices in the confirmal confi

Some milk was also sold above modal prices in all the uncontrolled merkets. Except for one smrket, as least 5 percent of all milk in each merket was sold above the modal price. In 10 markets, this accounted for over 50 percent of a sold merket in the same prices were selling milk at 2.0 or 10 milk was sold as these prices. In 27 uncontrolled markets, some milk was sold as these prices. In 27 uncontrolled markets, some milk was sold as 5 percent or more over modal prices (table 9).

Brand Pricing

Generally, model prices per half gellon for both store and processor brands of milk were the same in controlled markets. Some stores in each of 15 controlled markets had both types of brands, and in 11 of those markets the model price was the same for each brand (table 10). Processor brands sold from 1 to 4.9 onts higher in other controlled markets.

Table 7--Markets selling whole milk at the modal price, by percentage of all milk sold and type of market, 56 markets, 1969-71

. Uncontrolled	markets	
Controlled	markets	
Percent of milk sold in each	market at modal price	

Number

	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
market at modal price										
									90-100	Total
		20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59		70-79			
	0-19									
- 1	0	**	10	-2	w)	Ф	• ~	s	S	
										13

Table 8--Markets selling whole milk below the modal price, by percentage of all milk sold and type of markets, 56 markets, 1969-71

Percentage of milk		Markets w	Markets with sales of milk below	lk below		
sold in each market	0.1-1.9 cent	s that were	0.1-1.9 cents that were 5 cents and over that vere	over that vere-		Any emount that were
perow model price	· Controlled	Controlled . Uncontrolled	· Controlled ·	Controlled . Uncontrolled	ontrolled	· Uncontrolled
	MAINETS	markers	. markets	markets	· markets ·	markets
			Number			
0	. 12	11	22	22	=	u
0.1-4.9	,	6			; -	٦ <
5.0-9.9	9	23	1	100	1 4	
10.0-14.9	;	2	2	1 64		4 64
15.0-19.9	;	3	;	-		1 <
20.0-24.9	-		:			
25.0-29.9	;	:		٠,		4 0
30.0-34.9						η.
35.0-39.9					-	-
		٠,	;	:	:	:
0 07 0 29	;		:	:	:	2
	:	-	;	:	;	en
20.0-24-9	:	:	;	:	1	_
05.0-59.9	:	1	:	:	;	;
60.0-64.9	:	:	:	:	:	
55.0-69.9	:	;	;	1	:	
70.0-74.9			;		;	. ~
Total	23	33	23	33	23	33
an weens not and tasklo	ash 10					

means not applicable.

Table 9--Narkers selling whole milk above the modal price, by percentage of all milk sold and type of marker, 56 markers, 1969-71

	Dayson	Descent of aclt		Markets with	Markets with sales of milk above the model price by	above the sof	al price by			
	Targetti a	refeelt of milk	0.1-1.9 cer	ats that were	. 2.0-5.9 conta	s that were	· 9 or more c	0.1-1.9 cents that were 2.0-5.9 cents that were 9 or more cents that were Any amount that were	. Any amount	chat were
,	orice to	asch market	neign in each market Controlled	. Uncontrolled . Controlled . Uncontrolled . Controlled . Uncontrolled	Controlled :	Uncontrolled	· Controlled	. Uncontrolled	. Controlled . Uncontrolled	Uncontrolled
		1000	narkets	markers	markets	markets	narioets	markets	markets	markets
						Number of merkets	erkets			
				10	7	,	Ĩ	0	:	:
	0.1-4.9	0.1-4.9	9	6	24	9	a.	90	:	
	5.0-9.9	5.0-9.9	e .	4	ın	9	m	6	**	4
	10.0-14.9			47	-		1	60		N
	15.0-19.9		5		61	-	;	_		-
	20.0-24.9	6	5	2	4	4	1	:		'n
	25.0-29.9	6			e4	2	:			4
	30.0-34.9			:	~	60	:	:	:	-
	35.0-39.9		1	:	~	-	;	;	7	-
·	40.0-44.9			;	:	-	;	:	**	00
•	6.64-0.54	6	:	:		2	;	:	**	-
	50.0-54.9		:	:	;	:		;	4	5
	55.0-59.9		;	:	:	:	:	:	;	-
	60.00-66.9		:	:		:	:	:	**	~
	65.0-69.9	9	1	;	:	:	:	:	;	m
	70.0-74.5	70.0-74.9	;	:	:	:	:	;	2	-
	75.0-79.5	75.0-79.9								-

⁻⁻ means not applicable.

8

T5.0-76.9

33

Table 10-Markets selling whole milk by price differential, size of container (paper only), and type of market, 56 markets, 1969-71

	Model of Fference hersons assess		-							
	and processor brands	. Model d	ifferencial a	Model differential in stores with		: Medal diffe	Modal differential between processor brane in	in processor b	rond to	
	(cents per half nallon)	1010	store and processor brands	or brands		Parent Car	stores having only processor brand and store	seer brand and	store	
		. Helf gallen	llon	Callon	0.0	The same	Name of Stories Cavilly, both types of brands	outh types of	brands	
		Concrete	Uncontrolled	. Controlled :	Uncentrolled	. Controlled	Controlled Uncontrolled Controlled Uncentralish Controlled Uncontrolled Controlled Incontrolled	. Controlled	linear rolling	
			0 100	markets . markets	markets	SERVERS	· merkets	rarkets	myrkets	
	Processor brand above store brand-			No.	Number of markets	146				
	0	=	3	.*						
	0.1-0.9	:	•	,	;	12	18	-	10	
	1.0-2.9				;	:	;	;		
	2.0-2.9		0 :		64	-	-3"			
	3.0-3.0				٠	2			-	
	0 7.0 9		71	:	:					
		-	-	;					;	
		:	-	:				:	73	
	6.0.00	:	2				:	:	,	
	7.0-7.9	;				:	:	:	1	
	8.0-8.9	:				:	:	:	1	
	9.0-9.9	;			N	1		:	:	
	10.0-10.9		4 ;	:	;	;	:	;	:	
	11.0-11.9		:	;	į	ļ	-	:	-	
,	12.0-12.9				:	;	:	;	. ;	
			-	:	:	;	-	:	;	
	Store brand above processor brand: .									
	0.1-0.9	:	;	;	:					
	1.0-1.9	:	:		:	4	;	-	:	
	2.0-2.9	;					:	:	;	
					:	-	:	:	:	
	None in market 1/	80		20	61	9	¥	10	9	
	Total	23	ć	,						
		1	ç	ņ	33	E	23	22	33	

-- means not applicable. J. Data nor available for both types of brands in these markets.

Stores in uncontrolled markets usually priced store brands below processor brands. Stores in 30 uncontrolled markets had both types of brands. In only six of these markets was the modal price the seme. Store brands were priced 1 to 3.9 cents per half gallon below processor brands in over half of the markets.

A comparison of modal price differentials between processor brands in atoras having only processor brands and score brands in stores having both brands showed that in both controlled and uncontrolled and markets there were no differences in price between most stores. Most differences were due to higher prices for processor brands.

Milk Price Differentials Between Containers

Generally, the price of milk in helf gailon maper containers was higher than an equivalent mount at the gailon price, whereas the half-gailon price was less than an equivalent amount of milk at the quart price. On this besis, in no market was the price of milk in half gailons equal to or higher than the quart price. However, in a few markets, the half-gailon price was lower than the gailon price (table II).

Milk in paper half gallons usually sold at higher prices than glass half gallons. Of the 14 uncontrolled markets with both glass and paper, only two sold milk in glass at higher prices. In eight warkets, the price of milk in glass half gallons averaged 1.0 to 4.9 cents loss than that of paper.

Markets varied considerably in pricing milk in paper and plastic half gallons. Plastic half gallons were priced above and below paper half gallon in an equal number of uncontrolled markets. However, plastic half-gallon prices were higher in all but two controlled markets.

Milk Prices in Supermarkets and Other Foodstores

Generally, milk prices in dairy stores were lower than those in supermarkets, and conversioner store prices were higher. Milk prices in dairy stores were lower than those in supermarkets in about three-fourths of the 31 markets with dairy stores. In convenience stores, milk prices were higher than those in supermarkets in about seven-cenths of the 35 markets with convenience afores. In a few market, mostly controlled, prices were the same in all inter types of in a few market, mostly controlled, prices were the same in all three types of prices. The severage half-ignilon price in dairy stores in almost two-thirds of or prices in supermarkets. For convenience stores, the average milk price is, do percent of the markets (with higher prices) was 0.1 cent to 3.9 cents per half gallon above the supermarket price (table 12 and 13).

Table 11-Narhate selling various sizes and types of containors of whole milk, by price differential and type of markots, 36 markets,

Differential in weighted average price from balf gallon paper		Quare		Half gallon	allon				Gallon	uo.		
(cents per half gallon)		ner	ŀИ	Glass		Plastic	0	Class		Paner	- ld	Plante
	.Cont.	· Incont.		Cont Uncont		Cont Uncont Cont Uncont.	. Cont.	: Uncont.		Cent, : Uncont. ; Cent. : Uncont.	Cont.	Uncont.
					Numbe	Number of markets	a l					
TE 0-20 0	٠.											
20.000	:	~	1	:	ì	;	;	;	;	ì	;	;
19-0-13-9	;	-	1	;	1	;	;	;	;	;	;	
12.0-13.9	:	4	į	1	1	;	:	:	:	;		
10.0-11.9		6	:	:	ì	;		;				
8.0-9.9		'n	1	:	:							!
6.0-7.9	i	:	;	1	-	-	:	;	1			
4.0-5.9	. 12	9	1	;								
2:0-3.9		- 4		-	-	·				;	:	
1.0-1.9			1			•				:	;	
0.1-0.9			1	-	4 0		:		*		n,	ı
0.07-0.09	١.			,	n	٠.		-	ì	-	-	1
					:	4	;	:		:	-	;
No difference	1	;	1	;	ret	;	į	;	ı	;	-	~
Less than balf gallon paper by:												
0.1-0.9	1	:	-		0	-	1			,	,	
1.0-1.9	:	;	0	2	٠.		:	٠,	-	4 1		· ·
2.0-2.9		;	i	2	;		-	-	٠,	- 1-		4 6
3.0-3.9		;	-	2	;	-		٠,		- e		٧.
4.0-4.9	1	;	;	2	;	;	6				4 -	4 -
5.0-6.9	1	:	i		;	;	-	٠,		10		4 4
7.0-8.9	:	;	1	-	;	;	-	-	,			, <
9.0-10.9	1	;	;	:	1	:	;			,		ż
11.0-12.9	1	;	1	:	;	;	;	;				
13.0-14.9	1	:	1	-	;	;	;		1	,		
17.0-17.9	1	:	1	;	ı	1	:		;	٠:	: :	;
worse in market 1/	1	-	27	19	12	16	12	26	=	5	3	17
Total		33	23	33	23	33	23	33	23	33	23	33
											ĺ	

18

-- means not applicable. $\frac{1}{2}$ Noth sixes and types of containers unevailable for comparison,

Table 12--Markets selling whole milk in paper half gallons and gallons in convenience stores and supermarkets, by price differential and type of market, 35 markets, 1969-71

Differences in weighted everage prices	Hal	f gallon	Ga	llon
(cents per half gallon)	:Controlled	:Uncontrolled	Controlled	: Uncontrolled
		. markets	markets	
		Number of	markets	
onvenience stores above		1100000	-	
upermarkets:				
7.0-13.9		3		
6.0-6.9			1	I
4.0-5.9	. 3	2	1	1
2.0-3.9	: 6	5	3	2
1.0-1.9		3	2	3
0.1-0.9	:	3		
No difference	. 5		4	
Convenience stores below	:			
supermarkets;				
0.1-0.9		1		1
1.0-1.9	: 1	1		
2.0-2.9				
6.0-8.9	:	2	**	
No gallons stocked $\underline{1}/.$	·		4	12
Total	15	20	15	20

⁻⁻ means not applicable.

^{1/} Gallons not stocked in both supermarkets and convenience stores.

Table 13--Markets selling whole milk in paper half gallons and gallons in dairy stores and supermarkets, by price differential and type of market, 31 markets, 1969-71

Difference in weighted average prices	: Hal	f gallon	: Ga	11on
	Controlled	: Uncontrolled	: Controlled	: Uncontrolle
	markets	markets	markets	markets
		Number of	markets	
Dairy stores below		ROBBET OF	III III III	
supermarkets:				
10.0-13.9		1		1
5.0-7.9		1		ī
4.0-4.9		1		,
3.0-3.9:	1	2		ĩ
2.0-2.9	1	3		2
1.0-1.9	2	3	2	1
0.1-0.9:	5	3	1	2
No difference			4	1
Dairy stores above				
0.1-0.9:		3	2	1
1.0-1.9	1	1	ī	i
2.0-2.9	1	1		î
3.0-3.9				ī
4.0-4.9			1	~~
8.0-8.9		1		
No gallons stocked 1/				5
Total	11	20	11	20

⁻⁻ means not applicable.

^{1/} Gallons not stocked in both dairy stores and supermarkets.

Price Differentials Between Whole and Lowfat Milks

Generally, whole wilk prices were higher than prices for lowfat milks—vez-percent wilk, 1-percent milk, and skim milk. Whole milk in half gallons was priced (1) higher chan 2-percent milk in 80 percent of the markets, (2) higher than 1-percent milk in 53 percent of the markets, and (3) higher than skim milk in 94 percent of the markets (table 14).

In markers where whole milk prices were higher, the differential between the whole milk price and prices for loufst milk varied from market to market as well as among products. In most market, the buil-gallon price for 1percent milk was 0.1 cent to 1.9 cents below the building in the price price spread between whole milk and 2-percent milk was seemed under, a 0.1 cent to 5.9 cents. The price spread between whole and stan milk was the greaterranging from 1.0 to 10.0 cents, with a model differential between 3.0 to 3.9 cents.

In some markets, whole milk was priced below levdar products, especially leprecent milk. Whole milk was priced below leverest milk in 39 percent of the markets, and lower than 2-percent milk and skim milk in 18 and 6 percent of the markets, respectively. The ranges in price differences per haif gallon below the lowfar products were as follows: 1-percent milk, 0.01 cent to 10.9 cents; 2-percent milk, 0.01 cent to 10.9 cents; 2-percent milk, 0.02 to 10.9 cents.

COMPARISON OF CHAINSTORE PRICES WITH THOSE OF OTHER SUPERMARKETS

Supermarkets owned by chain organizations generally priced whole stilk are or below prices of other types of supermarkets. The average chainstore price for half gallons was below voluntary and cooperative stores in 32 percent of the markets, above in 36 percent, and the same in 12 percent. Chainstore prices per half gallon were below those for independents in 60 percent of the markets, above in 30 percent, and the same in 10 percent. The difference in price between chainstores and other supermarkets was generally 1 to 2 cents per half gallon-whether the chainstore price was above or below (table 15).

SALES BY TYPE OF CONTAINER

The proportion of all sitk sold is glass containers has been docitining gradually for sumy years. Peep rand, in more recent years, lastic knew hear replacity, glass. These changes have occurred more rapidly in supermarkets and two mericas were selling any milk in glass. In three mathetics, some wift knew the selling any milk in glass. In three mathetics, some wift knew heing sold in glass in convenience stores. Most of the milk sales in glass containers were made by dairy tores—in 5.48 percent of the warriets, dairy stores were selling some milk in glass along with various combinations of paper sold milk in glass along with various combinations of paper sold milk in glass gailtons out/(table 10), but sawkets (with dairy stores)

Table 14-Norbets selling whole milk and selected lowier milks in various sizes of paper containers, by price differential and type of market, 56 markets, 1969-71

The points in No. 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10,	Difference in weighted average prices		2-percent milk	ic nilk		.1-percent milk	t attk		Skin milk	11k	
	from whole milk in same container	Helt	gallon	Gall	ou	Half	sallon	eno .	1	Helf	wallen
	(cants per half gallon)	Cont.	Uncont.	Cont.	Uncont.	Cont. ;	Uncout.	Cont.	"Uncont.	Cont.	Uncont
					Mary	er of mir	kets				
	Less than whole nilk:						l				
	10.0-12.9	;	-1	;	1	:	;	;	e	,	:
	8.0-9.9	i	1	;	,	;	;	-			
		;	;								
######################################	6.0-6.9	;	:	:	٠,	:		DV	4 0	7	N F
######################################	5.0-5.9	;	9		:		-	۰,۰	,		7 6
	4.0-4.9	4			ur			3.0		ne	no
	3.0-3.9	-	10	h r-		٠,	4 6		0 0	۷.	4 0
TO THE TOTAL THE TARREST TO THE TARREST TH	2.0-2.9	-			4 0	, -	۰	4 4	٠,	ŧ	0
	9 7 9		3 0		4 0	4 ,		2	2	1	a
**************************************		D	2		N	n		1	24		2
	5.0-1.0	N	9	:	64	m	9	2	:	;	;
	0.01-0.09	-1	1.	:	:	ļ	ì	;	:	1	;
1	No difference		i	;	;	n	;	;	~	:	;
	The second secon										
	ANTE CHER MINTER BALES										
1	0.01-0.09	2	:	;	:	2	ì	į	;	:	:
	0.1-0.9		-	;	;		Nº1	:	;	:	
	1.0-1.9	;	;	1	ì		-	;	-		1
1	2.0-2.9	ţ	1	,	-	1		:	o	;	,
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	3.0-4.9	;					,		,		
	6.0-7.9		,								-
1 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10			4 .			:	;	:	:	;	:
2 0 20 18 6 14 0 3 4 12 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13		:	đ	-	;	1	-	;	gred	;	
\$ 0 20 18 6 14 0 3 4	11.0-13.9	;	;	;	1	;	;	1	;	1	:
5 0 20 18 6 14 0 3 4 23 33 23 33 23 33 23 33 23 33	14.0-16.9	;	1	ŀ	;	;	;	;	;	1	:
23 33 23 33 23 33 23 33 23 33 23 33											
23 33 23 33 23 33 23 33 23 33 23	None in market 3/	2	0	20	18	9	24	0	~	4	E)
	Total		33	23	33	53	33	23	33	23	33

-- means not applicable. $\underline{1}^{\prime}$ Complete data not available for these markets,

Table 15-Markets selling whole milk, by type of supermarket, price differential, size of container, and type of market, 32 markets, 1969-71

Differences in weighted average prices		lf gallon	:	1ton
(cents per half gallon)	Controlle	Uncontrolled	: Controlled	! Uncontrolle
		Number o	Frankata	
Ciginatores above voluntary and		MUNDET O	- HALLMAN	
cooperative stores:				
1.0=1.9		1		1
2.0-2.9				î
1.0-1.9		1		
0.1-0.9	3	3	1	2
		-		
No difference	3		7	
Disinstores below voluntary and				
cooperative stores:				
0.1-0.9	4	2	3	2
1.0-1.9	1	9		ī
2.0-2.9		ī	-	i
3.0-3.9				
4.0-4.9		1	-	
5.0-7.9		1	-	
No gallons in both types of stores;			1	5
Total:	12	13	12	13
Theinstores above independent stores:				
4.0-4.9				1
3.0-3.9		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
2.0-2.9		i		
1.0-1.9	1	1		1
No difference	1		2	1
heinstores below independent stores:				
0.1-0.9		2		3
1.0-1.9		î		í
2,0-2.9		i		
6.0-6.9		2		
No sellons in both types of stores				1
Total	2	8	2	8
Number of merkets	13	19	13	19

⁻⁻ means not applicable.

Table 16--Markets selling various --

Jable 15 - Markets seiling Various sixes and Lypes of containers, by kind of store and type of market, 56 markets, 1969-73	iling vario	is wixes and to	pes of con	cainers, by	kind of store	and type	of market, 5	6 markets, 19	69-73
Size and type of container	ng .	Supermarkets		Com	Conventence	ľ		Datry	
	Controlled	Controlled Uncontrolled Total Controlled Theory of Total	Total :	Controlled	Theone voltad	Toron	Contraction	grores	
							Carrie a Carriera a Carrie	COCOUNTALINO	10201
Half gallon:				Number	Number of markets				
Glass only	1	1	:	;	:	;	e	,	,
Glass and paper	1	;	;	;	-	-	40		0:
crass and plastic	1	;	;	;		٠,	•		ю.
Class, paper, plastic .	1	1	:	:				~ 0	٠,
raper only	=:	52	37	10	16	92	-	**	7 ;
raper and plastic	12	7	61	4	.,	40		, -	:
Flastic only	:	;	;	;		,		٠,	
								4	7
Gallonz									
Glass only	;	:	1						
Class and paper	;	;	: :	: :		١.	2 1	4	9
Glass and plastic	,	:				4	7	:	n
Glass, paper, plastic	1	cu	64	,	: :	-			··· (
Paper only	n	38	21		٠	4 0-		- 1	
Paper and plastic		0.	16	1 60			- 0	,	4.
Plastic only	=	st.	22	1.	• 1-	* 2	v 10	- 10	n «
No gallons sold	61	;	2	2		00	:	*	5
Markets with no stores	;	:	;	6	12	21	12	17	. 36
Number of narkers	23	11	95		5	:	;		1
			2	2	'n	90	53	33	36

24

-- means not applicable,

LOWFAT MILK SALES IN SOUTHEASTERN MARKETS

Generally, most lowfat milks sold in Southeastern markets were fortified with either vitamin D or vitamins A and D, although some unfortified lowfat milks were sold in nine markets. 2/ None was sold fortified with vitamin A only (table 17).

All markets sold 1- and 2-percent milks. One-percent milk appeared to the tie largest share of all lowfat milk sold. It made up over 60 percent of lowfat milk sales in almost 53 percent of the markets, whereas 2-percent milk consectuted over 60 percent of sales in only 24 percent of the markets (fable 18)

^{7/} No information given on cartons.

Table 17-Markete selling lowfar milk fortified with vitamins, by percentage of milk sold and type of market,

Percentage of total

lowfat milk sold in each mawles . Controlled . Theonreollad	. Controlled .	Incontrol lad		ŀ	NO INCOMEST	. No information on carton
100	markets	narkets	• •	markets . markets	Controlled - Uncontrol	Controlled - Uncontrolled
						Markets
0 1-0 0			Number o	Number of markets		
10 0.10 0		9	;		-	,
10.01		:				
20.0-29.9				-		1
30.0-39.9		4	:	:	:	7
9 67 U 07	:	;	ŀ	1		:
50 D-50 B		~	:	;		
		;	:	;		' '
6,60-0,0	;	;				
70.0-79.9	;				:	1
80,0-89.9		:	:	-	;	
0 0 0 0	:	;	2	:	:	
200.0	;		7			
100.0	:	;				
						;
Total	m	an .	7	٠	4	۰
Harkets with no vitamin milk	٠,	۰	-		٧	
					,	•
- Line form not seed to a						

Table 18--Markets selling lowfat milks, by percentage of milk sold and type of market, 17 Southeastern markets, 1971

Percent of lowfet milk	l- perce		: 2- perce	
sold in each market	· Controlled	Uncontrolled	. Controlled	: Uncontrolle
	markets	. markets	markets	. markets
	:			
		Number o	f markets	
0.1-9.9	1	2		
10.0-19.9	:		1	1
20.0-29.9			3	1
30.0-39.9	. 1			3
40.0-49.9	: 1	1	1	1
50.0-59.9	. 1	1	1	1
60.0-69.9		4	ï	
70.0-79.9	: 3	1		
80.0-89.9	· i			
90.0-99.9			1	2
	:			
Total	. 8	q	8	q

⁻⁻ means not applicable.

APPENDIX

New Jurpey Numerk-

Elizabeth

Large Markets Controlled

Uncontrolled

District of Col.

Small Markets Uncontrolled

New Hampshire Concord

Hanchester

Illinois Alton Peoria

Rockford

Rock Inland

Springfield

Florida Jacksonwille Georgia Atlanta Morth Carolina Askeville Charlotte Durling Winston-Sales Townessee Cluttancogs Knoxville Nashville

Maino

Virginia Bristol Portamouth-

Merfolk

Richmond

Roanske

Augusta Caribou

Portland			Ohio
Presque Isla	Connecticut	Pennsylvania	Cleveland
	Hartford	Philadelphia	CARVELDING
Vermone	Ngu Naven	Pittsburgh	Lilinois
Burlington		r a c c a c o z g n	Chicago
one sengton	Dalmere		cniengo
New Jersey	Viloton		
Atlantic City	o r mengeon		
Camien	Maryland		
Trentou	Baltimore		
1 renton	partimore		
Pennsylvania	West Virginia		
Krie	Charleston		
Harrisburg	Huntington		
Johnstown.	Kheeling		
Scrancon-			
Wilkes-Barre	Ohio		
	Akron		
Alobana	Canton		
Birwingher	Cincinneti		
Hontzowery	Columbus		
	Dayton		
South Carolina	Toledo		
Columbia	Youngstown		

